

II. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A. Status of the Claims

Claims 23-66 were pending at the time the September 9, 2005, Office Action issued from the U.S. Patent Office. Claims 24, 26, 30, 42, 47, and 49 have been amended, claims 28-29 and 45-46 have been canceled, and claims 67-80 have been added. Support for the pending claims can be found in the specification and originally filed claims. No new matter is added by this amendment. Therefore, claims 23-27, 30-44, and 47-80 are pending after entry of the amendment.

B. The Objection of Claim 26 Is Overcome

Claim 26 is objected to because the phrase "composition a" should be "composition A." Claim 26 has been revised to correct this typographical error. Applicants request that this objection be withdrawn.

C. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 29-34, 37, 38, 46, 47, 58-61¹, and 63-66 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In an effort to further the prosecution of this application and to secure prompt allowance, independent claims 24, 42, and 49, have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of allowed claims 29, 46, and 46, respectively. Additionally, newly added independent claims 67, 72, 74, and 76 are also directed to allowable subject matter. For example, claim 67 incorporates the subject matter of allowed claims 31, 32, and 33 in alternative format. New claim 72

¹ Claims 60-61 are subject to an obviousness-type double patenting rejection in view of claims 1-35 of U.S. Patent 6,740,699. Therefore, Applicants are not treating claims 60-61 as being allowable at this time. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants if this understanding is incorrect.

incorporates the subject matter of allowed claim 37. New claim 74 incorporates the subject matter of allowed claim 58. New Claim 76 incorporates the subject matter of allowed claims 63, 64, 65, and 66 in alternative format.

In view of the above, it is apparent that the present case is in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is requested.

C. The Anticipation, Obviousness, and Double Patenting Rejections Are Rendered Moot

Claims 42-45 and 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 10-25471, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over this reference. These claims are also rejected as being obvious over: (1) JP 10-25471 in view of Postle; and (2) JP 10-25471 in view the Declaration by Masonnier and Postle. Claims 24-27, 36, 39, 55-57, and 62 are rejected for double patenting in view of the claims of U.S. Patent 6,770,710. Claims 24-28, 35-36, 39-45, 48-50, 54-57, 60-62, and 66 are rejected for double patenting in view of claims 1-35 of U.S. Patent 6,740,699.

Applicants disagree. These claims are not anticipated or rendered obvious (including obviousness-type double patenting) over the cited references. As noted above, in an effort to further the prosecution and secure prompt allowance, the independent claims have been amended to incorporate allowed subject matter. Therefore, these rejections are rendered moot and should be withdrawn.

Applicants note that the amendments to the claims should not be construed as an acquiescence to the rejections. Applicants reserve the right to file a continuing application directed to additional subject matter in the future.

D. Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present document is a full and complete response to the Office Action dated September 9, 2005. The present case is in condition for allowance and such favorable action is requested.